

REMARKS

The Final Office Action dated August 5, 2009 has been carefully considered. Claim 4 has been amended. Claim 4 is in this application.

Support the invention defined by the present claims is found throughout the specification and in particular on page 8, lines 2-10. In particular it is disclosed with emphasis added that after the high temperature steam sterilization, 1.0% solution of emulsified oil in an amount of 150g was prepared as liquid for cooking rice and 75g of the solution was added before cooking to the each container having been sterilized and the rice in the container with the solution of emulsified oil was cooked for 30 minutes keeping steam temperature of 100°C. After cooking, the rest of the solution (75g) was added and it was hermetically sealed with lid film under aseptic conditions and left alone for 12 minutes to be well aged and then cooled in 10°C water for 15 minutes to finish manufacturing process.

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over previously cited U.S. Patent No. 3,892,058 to Komatsu et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,139,898 to Meyer et al. and Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (Specification pages 1-2).

The invention defined by the present claim teaches the steps of washing the long grain rice with only purified water, coating long grain rice washed with the purified water, and of sterilization which is conducted by repeating 4 to 10 times the sterilization by applying high pressure steam at a temperature of 130°C~150°C and for 4 to 8 seconds each time. In addition, the present claim includes the features of adding a solution of emulsified oil to the sterilized rice before cooking and the same amount of the solution of the emulsified oil is added after cooking of the rice and before sealing of the package.

In contrast to the invention defined by the present claim, Komatsu et al. do not teach or suggest the steps of adding a solution of emulsified oil to the sterilized rice before cooking and the same amount of the solution of the emulsified oil is added after cooking of the rice and before sealing of the package. Komatsu et al. do not teach or suggest adding the same amount of a solution of emulsified oil either before or after cooking. Applicants submit that through the steps of the present claim, an improved stickiness of cooked rice which was generated by repeated sterilization steps can be uniformly maintained in the sealed container for a long period

of time. There is no teaching or suggestions of the features in Kamatsu et al. Further, Komatsu et al. teach sterilization is conducted at 130°C~160° C for 0.5 minutes to 15 minutes for a single time in continuous sterilization (col. 15, lines 34-30).

Meyer et al. teach adding oil to the rice before or during the packaging steps. As shown in the examples, pre-cooked rice is soaked, blanched, cooled and acidified. Thereafter, oil is added to the package before the top is sealed. In contrast to the invention defined by the present claim, Meyer et al. do not teach or suggest adding a solution of emulsified oil to the sterilized rice before cooking and the same amount of the solution of the emulsified oil is added after cooking of the rice and before sealing of the package. Further, Meyer et al. teach that sterilization is conducted at 80°C~100° C for 1 minute to 80 minutes (col. 3, lines 1-17). Thus, Meyer et al. do not teach or suggest all the features of the present invention. In addition, Applicants Admitted prior art do not teach or suggest the steps of adding a solution of emulsified oil to the sterilized rice before cooking and the same amount of the solution of the emulsified oil is added after cooking of the rice and before sealing of the package. Accordingly, the invention defined by the present claims is not obvious in view of Komatsu et al. in combination with Meyer et al. and Applicants Admitted Prior Art and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and request that all claims be allowed. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned should she believe that this would expedite prosecution of this application. It is believed that no fee is required. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-2165.

Respectfully submitted,



Dated: February 5, 2010

Diane Dunn McKay, Esq.
Reg. No. 34,586
Attorney for Applicant

PORZIO, BROMBERG & NEWMAN, P.C.
29 Thanet Road, Suite 201
Princeton, NJ 08540
Tel: 609 924 8555
Fax: 609 924 3036